

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **5 May 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-6, 8-23, 25-40, and 42-55. Claims 1-2, 6, 8-9, 11-13, 17-19, 23, 25-26, 28-30, 34-36, 40, 42-43, 45-47, 51-53, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Klug et al. (USPN 5,790,785, hereinafter "Klug"). Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15, 17-23, 25-26, 28-30, 32 34-40, 42-43, 45-47, 49, and 51-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klug in view of Jacobs et al (USPN 5,611,048, hereinafter "Jacobs"), and further in view of Kelley et al (USPN 6,000,003 hereinafter "Kelley"). Claims 10, 14, 16, 27, 31, 33, 44, 48, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klug in view of Jacobs, further in view of Kelley and further in view of Jones et al (USPN 5,623,637, hereinafter "Jones").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 were rejected as being anticipated by Klug and as being unpatentable over Klug in view of Jacobs and further in view of Kelley. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Klug, Jacobs, and Kelley teaches determining if a **node ID is valid** (see Jacobs, col. 10, lines 15-28).

In contrast, the present invention authenticates the remote computer system that sent the request by **verifying a digital signature and certificate chain** for the remote computer system (see page 7, line 21 to page 8, line 7 of the instant application). This is different than determining if the node ID is valid because it also determines if the node is authorized to access the application. There is nothing within Klug, Jacobs, or Kelley, either separately or in concert, which suggests authenticating the remote computer system that sent the request by verifying a digital signature and certificate chain for the remote computer system.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 to clarify that the present invention authenticates the remote computer system that sent the request by verifying a digital signature and certificate chain for the remote computer system. These amendments find support on page 7, line 21 to page 8, line 7 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-6 and 8-17, which depend upon claim 1, claims 19-23 and 25-34, which depend upon claim 18, claims 36-40 and 42-51, which depend upon claim 35, and claims 53-54 which depend upon claim 52, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: 19 May 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665